



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,496	11/27/2006	Susana Fernandez-Alonso	PI8123-US1	1578

27045 7590 04/27/2010
ERICSSON INC.
6300 LEGACY DRIVE
M/S EVR 1-C-11
PLANO, TX 75024

EXAMINER

LEBASSI, AMANUEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

04/27/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

melissa.wingo@ericsson.com
kara.coffman@ericsson.com
jennifer.hardin@ericsson.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/595,496	Applicant(s) FERNANDEZ-ALONSO ET AL.	
	Examiner AMANUEL LEBASSI	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 January 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-16,18-25 and 27-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-16,18-25 and 27-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 April 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1, 3-16, 18-25, 27-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Objections:

2. **Claims** 8-13 are objected to because of the following informality: Because they depended on cancelled claim 2.

Appropriate correction is required

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-16, 18-25, 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas et al. US 20040039827 in view of Lev Ran et al. US 20040255048.

Regarding claim 1, Thomas discloses an Application Gateway Module suitable for use in a telecommunication system wherein a service network authenticates a user and authorizes the user for accessing a service offered by a

service provider (**paragraph [0064]-[0067], authentication and authorization and where an intermediary server is configured to ensure that access to the intranet 160 via the intermediary server**), the Application Gateway Module arranged for intercepting application messages between the user and the service and for identifying said user and said service (**paragraph [0259] where an LSP service intercepts messages/calls**). Thomas discloses means for obtaining authorization decision on whether the user is allowed to access the service (**Fig. 3, Authorization and authentications**). Thomas discloses the Application Gateway Module comprising: means for assigning a service session identifier intended to identify those application messages exchanged between the user and the service and that belong to a same service delivery authorized for said user (**paragraph [0075], service session identifier assigned to identify messages exchanged**). Thomas discloses means for configuring a first finite-state machine with a number of status intended to identify specific events in service delivery, the first finite state machine configured to control service progression (**paragraph [0286] - state machine controlling service progression**). Thomas discloses means for initiating a specific instance of the first finite-state machine, said specific instance being identified by the assigned service session identifier (**paragraph [0069] and [0286]**) and means for processing service policies applicable to said specific events and resulting in a state transition in the specific instance identified by the assigned service session identifier (paragraph [0068] and [0069] where services are processed using a

processing module and stored and used for session, state or identification purposes). However, Thomas is silent on activating service policies applicable to said specific events.

Lev Ran teaches activating service policies applicable to said specific events (paragraph [0204] and [0459] where policy can be activated in specific time range).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Thomas and add activating service policies applicable to said specific events. The motivation would be to provide quality of service (paragraph [0003]).

Regarding claim 15, Thomas discloses telecommunication system wherein a service network authenticates a user and authorizes the user for accessing a service offered by a service provider (**paragraph [0059] and Fig. 1A authentication and authorization by system network**), the Authorization Module arranged for deciding whether a user is allowed to access a service (**paragraph [0059] where access to the network is permitted after successful authentication**). Thomas discloses means for receiving a service authorization request from an Application Gateway Module (**paragraph [0058] – service authorization request**) and means for returning to the Application Gateway Module a response on whether the user is granted access to the requested service (**paragraph [0059] where access is authenticated and**

permitted therefore a response returned on whether the user is granted access to the requested service). Thomas discloses the Authorization Module comprising: means for generating a service session identifier intended to correlate those application messages exchanged between the user and the service and that belong to a same service delivery authorized for said user **(paragraph [0072] – where service session identifier is generated and stored).** Thomas discloses means for configuring a second finite-state machine with a number of status intended to identify specific events in service progression, the second finite-state machine usable by the Authorization Module to act over the Application Gateway Module to control the service progression **(paragraph [0286] - state machine controlling service progression)** and means for initiating a specific instance of the second finite-state machine, said specific instance being identified by said service session identifier **(paragraph [0069])** and means for processing service policies applicable to said specific events and resulting in a state transition in the specific instance identified by the assigned service session identifier (paragraph [0068] and [0069] where services are processed using a processing module and stored and used for session, state or identification purposes). However, Thomas is silent on activating service policies applicable to said specific events.

Lev Ran teaches determining service policies applicable to said specific events (paragraph [0204] and [0459] where policy can be activated in specific time range).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Thomas and add determining service policies applicable to said specific events. The motivation would be to provide quality of service (paragraph [0003]).

Regarding claim 25, Thomas discloses a method for authorizing a user of a service network to access a service offered by a service server of a service provider, the user already authenticated by the service network, the server arranged to deliver a service that comprises a plurality of transactions by exchanging a plurality of application messages with the user (**paragraph [0059] and Fig. 1A authentication and authorization by system network**), the method comprising the steps of: obtaining a first authorization decision on whether the user is allowed to access the service (**Fig. 3, Authorization and authentications**). Thomas discloses generating and assigning a service session identifier intended to identify those application messages exchanged between the user and the service and that belong to a same service delivery authorized for said user (**paragraph [0075], service session identifier assigned to identify messages exchanged**). Thomas discloses least one finite-state machine with a number of status intended to identify specific events in service delivery , the finite-state machine usable for controlling service progression (**paragraph [0286] - state machine controlling service progression**). Thomas discloses initiating a specific instance of the at least one finite-state machine, said specific instance

Art Unit: 2617

being identified by the assigned service session identifier (**paragraph [0069] and [0286]**) and processing service policies applicable to said specific events and resulting in a state transition in the specific instance identified by the assigned service session identifier (paragraph [0068] and [0069] where services are processed using a processing module and stored and used for session, state or identification purposes). However, Thomas is silent on activating service policies applicable to said specific events.

Lev Ran teaches activating service policies applicable to said specific events (paragraph [0204] and [0459] where policy can be activated in specific time range).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Thomas and add activating service policies applicable to said specific events. The motivation would be to provide quality of service (paragraph [0003]).

Regarding claim 3, Thomas discloses wherein the means for activating service policies include means for setting at least one element selected from a non-exhaustive list of references and attributes that comprises: a number of message field values to match, a number of specific actions to carry out on matching, a number of timer values to run, and a number of transactions to supervise (**paragraph [0438] where flow timer is run**).

Regarding claim 4, Thomas discloses wherein the means for activating service policies include means for activating a global service policy independently of any service delivery in progress (**paragraph [0013]**).

Regarding claim 5, Thomas discloses wherein the means for activating service policies include means for initiating an instance of a global service policy to apply as an individual service policy within a specific instance of the first finite-state machine, the individual service policy inheriting references and attributes from the global service policy (**paragraph [0438]**).

Regarding claim 6, Thomas discloses further comprising means for overwriting references and attributes of an individual service policy with new references and attributes during a service progression handled within a specific instance of the first finite- state machine (**paragraph [0101]**).

Regarding claim 7, Thomas discloses wherein a particular state is associated with a number of individual service policies within a specific instance of the first finite-state machine, said instance identified by a given service session identifier (**paragraph [0069]**).

Regarding claim 8, Thomas discloses wherein the means for obtaining an authorization decision include means for requesting a service authorization from

Art Unit: 2617

an Authorization Module (**paragraph [0067] where processing modules include an authentication manager**).

Regarding claim 9, Thomas discloses wherein the means for activating service policies include means for receiving from the Authorization Module at least one element applicable to set a service policy, the element selected from a non-exhaustive list of references and attributes that comprises: a number of message field values to match, a number of specific actions to carry out on matching, a number of timer values to run, and a number of transactions to supervise (**paragraph [0438]**).

Regarding claim 10, Thomas discloses wherein the means for activating service policies includes means for receiving a global service policy from the Authorization Module (**paragraph [0058] and [0438]**).

Regarding claim 11, Lev Ran teaches means for receiving references and attributes from the Authorization Module applicable to overwrite an individual service policy with new references and attributes during a service progression handled within a specific instance of the first finite-state machine (**paragraph [0073]**).

Regarding claim 12, Thomas discloses means for notifying to the Authorization Module a specific event in service progression (**paragraph [0058]**).

Regarding claim 13, Thomas discloses means for requesting from the Authorization Module a further processing to determine an appropriate action to go on with the service progression (see Fig. 8A and Fig. 8B).

Regarding claim 14, Thomas discloses means for receiving from the Authorization Module an instruction selected from: access granted without restriction, another service to substitute a previous service requested, forced log out, and indication of a state transition (see abstract).

Regarding claim 16, Thomas discloses wherein the means for generating a service session identifier comprise means for including said service session identifier in the response to be returned to the Application Gateway Module on whether the user is granted access to the requested service (**paragraph [0009]-providing secure access to resources maintained on private networks**).

Regarding claim 18, Thomas discloses wherein a particular state is associated with a number of service policies within a specific instance of the second finite- state machine, said instance identified by a given service session identifier (**paragraph [0069]**).

Regarding claim 19, the combination of above discloses wherein the means for determining service policies comprise means for including in the response towards the Application Gateway Module at least one information element to activate a service policy within a specific state in the Application Gateway Module, said at least one information element selected from a non-exhaustive list of references and attributes that comprises: a number of message field values to match and a set of actions to carry out on matching a given message field value and a number of new timer values to run; and - a number of transactions to supervise (see above).

Regarding claim 20, Lev Ran teaches wherein the means for including in the response towards the Application Gateway Module at least one information element to activate a service policy include means for indicating that this is a global service policy to apply independently of any service delivery in progress **(paragraph [0016])**.

Regarding claim 21, Lev Ran teaches means for receiving a notification, from an Application Gateway Module indicating a specific event detected in service progression **(paragraph [0011])**.

Regarding claim 22, Lev Ran teaches means for receiving a request, from an Application Gateway Module, asking for an instruction to proceed with a service progression **(paragraph [0142])**.

Regarding claim 23, Thomas discloses means for sending towards the Application Gateway Module an instruction selected from: access granted without restriction, another service to substitute a previous service requested, forced logout, and indication of a state transition **(paragraph [0009])**.

Regarding claim 24, Thomas discloses a number of application servers and provisioning systems, the application message including a given service session identifier intended to identify a specific instance of the second finite-state machine in the Authorization Module **(paragraph [0069])**.

Regarding claim 27, Thomas discloses wherein a particular state within the specific instance of the at least one finite-state machine is associated with a number of service policies **(paragraph [0069])**.

Regarding claim 28, Thomas discloses wherein the step of activating service policies includes a step of setting at least one element selected from a non-exhaustive list of references and attributes that comprises: a number of message field values to match, a number of specific actions to carry out on

Art Unit: 2617

matching, a number of timer values to run, and a number of transactions to supervise (**paragraph [0438] where flow timer is run**).

Regarding claim 29, Thomas discloses a step of receiving at the service network an application message originated at an entity selected from: a number of service servers of a service provider and a number of entities of a provisioning system, the application message including a given service session identifier intended to identify a specific instance of the at least one finite-state machine (**paragraph [0069]**).

Regarding claim 30, the combination of above discloses wherein the step of configuring at least one finite-state machine further comprises configuring a first finite- state machine in an Application Gateway Module and configuring a second finite-state machine in an Authorization Module (see above).

Conclusion

1. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Amanuel Lebassi, whose telephone number is (571) 270-5303. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Nick Corsaro can be reached at (571) 272-7876. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you

Art Unit: 2617

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Amanuel Lebassi

/A. L./

04/20/2010

/NICK CORSARO/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617